Kr. Ransey Clark
c/othe Hation (Please Forward)
72 Fifth Ave.,
Hew York, NY 10011

Harold Weisberg 7627 Old Receiver Rd. Frederick, MD 21702

Doar Hr. Clark,

Please understand to begin with that this is not written an accusation but your The Nation editorial that is headed "Shedding Light on Ray" should really have been headed "Shedding Light on the Department of Justice."

I have no reason to believe that you had any part in the plea your Department of Justice negotiated with the infanous Percy Poreman when he was Ray's lawyer but I am confident that those under you persuaded the King family and associates that you had a solid case against Ray when you had noned at II. Incredible as it may seem, I do mean quite literally no case at all. It could not even place Ray in Department of the Worling and it lied, by which I mean it was perfect that the consciously untruthful in the affidavit it gave the Bartish court that when the consciously untruthful in the affidavit it gave the Bartish court that when the consciously untruthful in the affidavit it gave the Bartish court that when the consciously untruthful in the affidavit it gave the Bartish court that when the conscious to the court that when the conscious that we have the same and the court that when the conscious that we have the conscious that the court that when the conscious that we have the conscious that the court that we have the conscious that we have the conscious that we have the conscious that the court that we have the conscious that the court that we have the conscious that the court that we have the conscious that we have the conscious that the court that we have the conscious that we have the conscious that the court that we have the court that we have the conscious that the court that we have the conscious that the court that we have the conscious that the co

consciously untruthful in the diffidavit it gave the ENT lish court that seemed to identify May as hand, been seen in that flophouse when the alcoholic had already told the FET and CLS News that May was not the man he calimed he had seen.

This may all seem strangs to you, perhaps impossible, but please believe me it understates the actualities. I was Ray's investigator beginning in as I now recall 1972. I provided him with the counsel who replaced the right wing nuts he had, I did the investigating for the successful habens corpus and then for the two weeks of evidentiary heuring infederal district court in Kemphis. Contrary to what you write in a case of this sort the Constitutional guarantees are not real. The judge decided against all the evidence. He actually said, having been compelled to by the case I developed and the lawyers presented, that "guilt or innocence were immaterial" to what was before him when what was before him was whether the plea was coorced, as it was, and whither he had the effective assistance of counsel, when a case that exculrated Ray was presented and survived cross-examination guilt or innocence were not immaterial. That alone proved may had not had the effective assistance of counsel.

Counsel who on several other occasions put his clients away, much to the satisfactuon of the department and for the FM becelve when he was finally caught he did not go to fail.

Please excuse my typing. I'm almost 84 and my health is imparted. It cannot be any botter.

Along with the ling family and friends you seem to assume day's guilt and to believe he can name those with whom he allegedly conspired in the assassination. This belief comes from what your associates in the Department of Justice laid don them at the time Ray was to be tried. Your associates knew they had no coal of this THE WHILL WE THE King family and associates, alas. I suspect that inson and Follak were most responsible for that.

I filed a FOIA lawsuit against the Department and the FEI, which stalled it for a decade, but innertheless got many thousands of pages including most of the FEI's MUNKIN file. It had no case at all. Period!

I have those records and I have the transcripts of that evidentiary hearing if you want amyone to examine them. (I've written Dexter King without response.)

More, and I'm sure you had no knowledge of it - and that judge ignored this, too - your Deparlment prepared a book for the locals on how to keep Ray #safe" when there was no special denor he faced. Among the instructions to the locals—and we got this from the sheriff's files and entered it into evidence - from your Department was that even 'ay's corresondence with his lawyers be intercepted and xeroxed! We actually got some symples of that. When belatedly the PNI parmed that Judge Battle had iccord an order against that when the telm defence had no proof of it, it dustricted its "emphis office to accept the information addition."

Even Ray's letters to the judge were intercepted and copied! We got would have no people told the locals to cover well jail widown that were already barred with heavy steel plates, to keep in under constant lights, to have him on closed@circuit TV, with sound constantly recorded, and for all the time he was jailed he never saw the sun or the moon or been whether it was night or day.

was jailed he never saw the sun or the moon or inew whither it was night or day.

You rejused the FBI permission to tap any any commens. It argued that even
if it got caught and the case was lost it was worth that risk and more to be
able to locate and arrest gay (and it had nothing to do with that in any event!)
and it ignored you and tapped those phones anyway. It picked me up when I was
talking to brother Jerry Ray at the beginning of the arranging for his
chumsel but by the time times records were processed under FOIA those doing
that did not undertand what they were disclosing. Jerry's call to no was tapped.
and it got me in at least a half-dozen FBI bank-robbery files, impossible as
that may seem! I have copies of them! Hall map a way. Matting for K vallery Cane

I ay familiar with the new supposed solution. From my own work I have no configence in it. I also believe that day can make no identification of those with whom he was then associated. I know he could not to me and I spent days on end with him at farusly muntual in the effort. He would not give me the phone

numbers he used to make contact. He said he'd not get out of jail by putting someone clase in jail. He had no fear that he would be killed in jail and two of the "risky hountain wardens, both of when extended full court sies and more to me, told me they read all the sail of all the black pristners and not one believed Ray was suilty.

As I said to begin with, I as certain you were not party to any of this, but the fact in that when you were the Attorney General your people imposed on the trust of King's family and associates to get them to agree to the please when without that there was Mo chance of it being acceptable. And then that was with a lie, that day would otherwood be sentenced to death. That did not happen in those days. There was no chines of it had been convicted and no chance of conviction at all. May all your layer with May with the context of the conviction at all.

This new jerk about testing the rifle is not all thather. I presented an authentic expert who examined the remains of bullet recovered from King's body. The testified that given that remains and that rifle and being ally bed to test fire that rifle he could and would testified without question that that rifle had or had not fired that builded. Knowing that it had not, the Ful'd expert, Robert Lraxier, executed an affideant statistic there were not enough marks of distrinction for any comparison. At FB/ that in My, en Mir,

Moreover, if the shooting h d been as the FII alleged the shooter and part of his rifle would have had to have been inside the wall of that flophouse bathroom! Withhout question transf, too!

After you were no longer attorney Veneral I tried to get in touch with you to ask you to take the case over. I got no response. The King family and associates also did not respond when \underline{I} tried to reach them.

I'm sorry by typing and writing cannot be any better but I assure you that the foregoing is true, is understated, and that I can document all of fit.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

With senior counsel abroad it fell to junior counsel, who had never been before a jury, and to me to prepare the case. We divided it with him taking the law and I the evidence. With Foreran then the most femous of criminal lawyers I decided that the only way to prove he had not provided effective assistance as counsel was to try the case alleged against Ray and disprove it. That we did. For crefutation, no rebuttal, not a single FEI witness! I could do that and Foreman could not?